

wriggle room because what we care about is whether kids are learning, not whether they spend 5 minutes or 2 hours doing it. I've talked to folks who use apprenticeships, who use online education, and we should hold them accountable for results where there is taxpayer money at hand, but at the same time we want to make sure that there's a backstop for what I think folks on both side agree exist, which is waste, fraud, and abuse in the system. What my amendment would do is replace the specifics of these regulations with a directive to the Department of Education to come up with an alternative plan that protects taxpayer dollars and students' rights.

This would make sure that we can deal with many of the issues raised by the inspector general, not by providing an overly arching and rigid definition of time that's a necessary part of education but, rather, by requesting and requiring that the Secretary come up with ideas that are consistent with the future of education towards combating waste, fraud, and abuse.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I appreciate the very positive comments that my colleague from Colorado has made about the underlying bill. I hope very much that he will support it. I appreciate, actually, serving with him on the Rules Committee and the often commonsense approaches that he brings to legislation that we're reviewing. However, I have to say reluctantly that I am opposing his amendment.

I don't think, again, that we need to ask the Department of Education to present more plans or more rules and regulations. It is certainly doing a lot to present rules and regulations that are totally unnecessary.

Next year we will have the reauthorization of the higher education bill. As I think most people know, the Speaker has asked all the committees, all the subcommittees to exercise their oversight responsibilities, and we are certainly doing that and will continue to do that. Therefore, I think that the gentleman from Colorado's amendment is unnecessary, and I oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1450

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I think that, again, my amendment would provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate alternative higher-education settings. The reason we're talking about rules and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse is not somehow the government is going someplace that's unwarranted; but these are Federal student loans, these are Federal programs we're talking about. We do not want taxpayers to be ripped off, and we do not want students to be ripped off. I believe that directing the Secretary to come up with

an alternative plan to the one we're stripping out would go a long way toward accomplishing that.

And I agree with the gentlewoman from North Carolina. Fundamentally, many of these issues need to be discussed during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act; and I hope that she will join me at that point, yes, on freeing up the inputs-based measurements, but equally, if not more important, making sure we hold the recipients of taxpayer-funded programs accountable for the outcomes.

And there is no perfect outcome-based measurement—we know this from K-12 education as well—but even a mediocre one is better than none. And I think it will fall upon this Congress to do that. I think that this bill facilitates that discussion; but should it become law, I would certainly hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can join me in supporting this commonsense directive to ensure that waste, fraud, and abuse do not enter the system along with freeing up innovation and thoughtful new ways to educate kids.

I urge my colleagues to join me on voting "yes" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chairman, again, I appreciate the sentiments of my colleague from Colorado; but I would say to him that there is absolutely nothing to prevent the Secretary of Education from coming to the Education and Workforce Committee and presenting his ideas on where there is waste, fraud, and abuse. We would be more than happy to do that. Most of what we hear from the administration is spend, spend, spend, not how can we save money, but spend, spend, spend.

All of us want to make sure that every dime of taxpayers' money is well spent, and I can assure you that members of my committee want to see that the money is well spent, and we'll be working on that issue as we have been working on it, as will all the Republican majorities in the House do that.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2117) to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1515

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENISHEK) at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PROTECTING ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 563 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2117.

□ 1516

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2117) to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, with Mrs. EMERSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-404 by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-404 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.